

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 19, 22, 23, 35, 37, 39, 40, 50, 52-54, 64 and 65 have been amended.

Claims 3 and 21 have been canceled. Claims 1-2, 4-20, and 22-65 remain pending.

Applicants appreciate Examiner's consideration of Applicant's arguments filed August 25, 2006.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

On page 5, paragraph 8, of the above captioned Office Action, Examiner rejects claims 1-4, 10-12, 16-22, 25-27, 31-39, 42-44, 48-53, 56-58, and 62-65¹ under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent Publication No. 2001/0054064 issued to Kannan (“Kannan”). It is well settled that to anticipate a claim under §102(e), the prior art reference must disclose each and every element of the claimed invention.

Claim 1, as amended, claims a method comprising:

determining based at least in part on content of a locator of a first information page requested to be retrieved and displayed on a client system, whether to provide information browsing assistance for the first information page, amplifying information of the first information page, said content of the locator identifying the first information page and a location from which the first information page is to be retrieved, said determining comprising analyzing the content of the locator of the first information page to determine whether the locator satisfies a locator based condition abstracting a plurality of locators of a plurality of locations having information that amplifies the information of the first information page; and

conditionally providing said information browsing assistance based at least in part on said determination.

Kannan discloses a system to determine if a website user is confused and, if so, to provide customer assistance in the form of a pop-up window. To do this, Kannan determines whether the user has spent an inordinate amount of time at a single page or is bouncing back and forth between two pages. This, according to the method of Kannan, indicates that the

¹ On page 10, paragraph 26 of the above-captioned Office Action, Examiner rejects claim 65 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 in light of Kannan, though claim 65 is not mentioned in paragraph 8.

user is confused. Thus, the Kannan method arguably analyzes the content of the locator of a first information page to determine if it meets a locator based condition. However, it can not be said that the locator based conditions of Kannan include “abstracting a plurality of locators of a plurality of locations having information that amplifies the information of the first information page” as required by claim 1. A locator based condition that determines if a user has spent more than a certain amount of time at a page is not “abstracting a plurality of locators” as required by claim 1. Likewise, a locator based condition that determines if the user is bouncing between two pages is not “abstracting a plurality of locators” as required by claim 1. Thus, Applicants submit that Kannan does not disclose each and every element of claim 1.

Thus, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over Kannan.

Further, claims 2, 4, 10-12, 16-18 depend from claim 1 incorporating its limitations. Thus, for at least the same reasons above, Applicants submit that claims 2, 4, 10-12, and 16-18 are patentable over Kannan.

Independent claims 19, 35, 50, 64, and 65 contain in substance the same limitations as claim 1. Additionally, claims 20, 22, 25-27, and 31-34; 36-39, 42-44, 48, and 49; and 51, 53, 56-58, 62, and 63 depend from claims 19, 35, and 50, respectively, incorporating their limitations. Thus, for at least the same reasons as with claim 1 above, Applicants submit that these claims are also patentable over Kannan.

Claims 3 and 21 have been canceled rendering their rejections moot.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

On page 12 of the above-captioned office action, claims 5-8, 23, 24, 40, 41, 54, and 55 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kannan in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,397,246 issued to Wolfe (“Wolfe”).

Claims 5-8 depend from claim 1 incorporating its limitations. As discussed above, claim 1 is patentable over Kannan. Further, Wolfe fails to remedy the deficiency of Kannan. Specifically, Wolfe discloses matching various characteristics of a URL request – such as the URL, time of day, source IP address, etc. – to decide whether to display a pop-up ad. The

text Examiner cites in column 5, lines 32-50, for example, shows that if the www.cnn.com URL is requested, a pop-up ad is displayed.

First, a pop-up ad is not “information browsing assistance, *amplifying information of the first information page*”. Pop-up ads do not amplify the information in webpages; they distract the user.

Second, even if the method of Wolfe were characterized as analyzing the content of the locator of the first information page to determine whether the locator satisfies a locator based condition, the locator based condition of Wolfe is not disclosed as abstracting a plurality of locators of a plurality of locations having information that amplifies the information of the first information page as required by claims 5-8. A locator based condition that determines if a requested URL matches www.cnn.com, for example, does not *abstract a plurality of locators*. Rather, it is a locator based condition that requires the requested URL to match a *single locator*.

Further, there could have been no suggestion to modify Kannan to achieve the method of claims 5-8. The purpose of Kannan is to provide customer service help to confused web users. Analyzing the locator of a requested page to determine if the locator matches a locator based condition abstracting a plurality of locators would not help determine if the user is confused. *A locator of an information page that matches such a condition would match for all users, whether they were confused or not*. Thus, it would not have been helpful to modify Kannan to include the locator based condition of claims 5-8. Therefore, there could have been no suggestion to modify Kannan to achieve the method of claim 1. As such, Applicants submit that claims 5-8 are nonobvious and therefore patentable over Kannan either alone or in combination with Wolfe.

Additionally, claims 23, 24, 40, 41, 54, and 55 all depend from claims 19, 35, and 50, respectively, which contain in substance the same limitations as claim 1. Thus, for at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants submit that these claims are also patentable over Kannan in view of Wolfe.

On page 15, paragraph 38 of the above-captioned Office Action, claims 13, 28, 45, and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Kannan in view US Patent No. 5,960,429 issued to Peercy et al (“Peercy”).

Claims 13, 28, 45 and 59 depend from claims 1, 19, 35, and 50, respectively, incorporating their limitations. As discussed above, claim 1 is patentable over Kannan. Further, Peercy fails to remedy the deficiency of Kannan. Peercy discloses a method by which a list of popular websites is compiled. It does not provide locator based conditions at all, much less locator based conditions *“abstracting a plurality of locators of a plurality of locations having information that amplifies the information of the first information page”* as required by claim 13. Also, for at least the reasons discussed above, there could have been no suggestion to modify Kannan to achieve the limitations of claim 13. Thus, for at least this reasons, Applicants submit that claim 13 is nonobvious and therefore patentable over Kannan in view of Peercy.

Further claims 28, 45, and 59 depend from claims 19, 35, and 50 which contain in substance the same limitaitons as claim 1. Thus, for at least these reasons Applicants submit that these claims are also patentable over Kannan in view Peercy.

On page 16 paragraph 40 of the above-captioned Office Action, claims 14, 15, 29, 30, 46, 47, 60, and 61 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Kannan in view of US Patent No. 6,026,409 issued to Blumenthal (“Blumenthal”).

Claims 14, 15, 29, 30, 46, 47, 60 and 61 depend from claims 1, 19, 35, and 50, respectively, incorporating their limitations. As discussed above, claim 1 is patentable over Kannan. Further, Blumenthal fails to remedy the deficiency of Kannan. Blumenthal discloses a method by a user search initiates two windows, one with locally-stored information that matches the user search, and the other with global information that matches the search. It does not provide locator based conditions at all, much less locator based conditions *“abstracting a plurality of locators of a plurality of locations having information that amplifies the information of the first information page”* as required by claim 14. Also, for at least the reasons discussed above, there could have been no suggestion to modify

Kannan to achieve the method of claim 14. Thus, for at least this reason, Applicants submit that claim 14 is nonobvious and therefore patentable over Kannan in view of Blumenthal.

Further claims 14, 15, 29, 30, 46, 47, 60, and 61 depend from claims 19, 35, and 50, respectively, which contain in substance the same limitations as claim 1. Thus, for at least these reasons Applicants submit that these claims are also patentable over Kannan in view of Blumenthal.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-30 are solicited. Applicant submits that claims 1-2, 3-20, and 22-65 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present paper, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (206) 407-1542. If any fees are due in connection with filing this paper, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the Deposit Account of Schwabe, Williamson and Wyatt, P.C., No. 50-0393.

Respectfully submitted,
SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.

Date: February 13, 2007

by: Richard B. Leggett/
Richard B. Leggett
Reg. No.: 59,485

Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt, P.C.
Pacwest Center, Suites 1600-1900
1211 SW Fifth Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97222
Telephone: 503-222-9981